

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested. In response to the Office Action ("Action") dated August 29, 2006, Applicants submit the following remarks. Claims 1-18 are pending. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

I. **REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF REJECTION**

Applicants respectfully request that the subsequent Office Action clarify which component, device, etc., in U.S. Patent No. 7,062,563 to Lewis et al. ("Lewis") allegedly anticipates "at least one database connection definition" recited in claim 1. The Action cites column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5 and column 10, lines 37-52 of Lewis as allegedly anticipating the claimed "at least one database connection definition." However, it is unclear to what the Action is referring in these cited columns. More particularly, it is unclear what component, device, etc. in these cited columns of Lewis anticipates this claim feature. Clarification is respectfully requested in any forthcoming Office Action.

II. **RESPONSE TO THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

On pages 2-3, the Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lewis. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

A. *Response to the Rejection of Claim 1*

Claim 1 recites:

A method for implementing database connection mapping for connecting a user to at least one database in a reporting system, comprising the steps of:
enabling a user to submit a user identification input and a user request to a reporting system;
identifying the user based on user identification input; and
controlling access to at least one database through a centralized server wherein the *centralized server maps the user to at least one appropriate database based on the user request and at least one database connection definition.* (Emphasis added.)

To reject claim 1, the Action relies on Lewis. Lewis discloses a “method and system for managing access information for users and other entities in a distributed computing system.”

See Lewis, Abstract. Lewis discloses that when “a user at computer access device 106 seeks to access a first database 108 or a second database 110, ‘authentication’ information is communicated from access device 106 *to the respective database for which access is sought*” (emphasis added). See Lewis, FIG. 1, col. 3, ll. 6-10. Lewis further discloses that the “centralized directory information system 104 communicates with each database 108 and 110 to authenticate users that seek to access any of the databases serviced by the centralized directory information system 104.” See Lewis, col. 3, ll. 20-23.

For at least the following reasons, Lewis does not anticipate claim 1.

Lewis does not disclose “wherein the *centralized server* maps the user to at least one appropriate database based on the user request and *at least one database connection definition*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. To reject these claim features, the Action cites column 7, line 47-column 8, line 5 and column 10, lines 37-52 of Lewis (see Action, page 3), which disclose a “mapping object.” The Action appears to be arguing that Lewis discloses the centralized directory information system 104 using “mapping objects” to map a user to at least one appropriate database (e.g., database 108 and/or 110) based on a user request and at least one

database connection definition. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lewis does not disclose the directory information system 104 using the “mapping objects” to map a user to at least one appropriate database based on a user request and at least one database connection definition. Lewis discloses that the “mapping objects” contain “mapping information between a full or partial distinguished name (“DN”) in the directory information system and a user/schema name.” See Lewis, col. 5, ll. 55-57. More particularly, Lewis discloses that the “mapping objects” are “used for schema assignments, to map enterprise users to local database schemas.” See Lewis, col. 7, ll. 47-50. Lewis further discloses that the “mapping object contains the mapping of an enterprise DN and a native database username” and provides an example of when “the mapping object is a group object, . . . the CN attribute reflects the schema name and the members attribute contains all users who map to that schema.” See Lewis, col. 7, ll. 50-57. Hence, Lewis discloses that the mapping object contains a relationship between an enterprise distinguished name and a native database username. See Lewis, col. 7, ll. 50-57, but does not disclose the mapping object mapping the user to database 108 or 110 based on any database *connection* definition.

The directory information system 104 of Lewis, however, does not use the “mapping objects” to map a user to database 108 or 110 based on a user request and at least one database connection definition. It is unclear what component in Lewis the Action construes as allegedly anticipating the claimed “at least one database connection definition.” Clarification of this portion of the rejection is requested above.

Nevertheless, Lewis does not disclose that the directory information system 104 performs any mapping of a user of the computer access device 106 to at least one of database 108 or 110 using a “mapping object” based on “at least one database connection definition.” Instead, Lewis

discloses that when “a user at computer access device 106 seeks to access *a first database 108 or a second database 110*, ‘authentication’ information is communicated from access device 106 to the respective database for which access is sought” (emphasis added). See Lewis, col. 3, ll. 6-10. The statement in Lewis of the database “for which access is sought,” implies that the computer access device 106 is already connected and communicating with either database 108 or 110 during forwarding of the “authentication information.” This forwarding of the authentication information in Lewis occurs before the directory information system 104 interacts with either database 108 or 110 to authenticate the user. See Lewis, col. 3, ll. 6-26. Thus, the directory information system 104 is not mapping a user of the computer access device 106 to either database 108 or 110 based on “at least one database connection definition.”

Even after authentication of the user, Lewis does not disclose that the directory information system 104 maps the user to database 108 and/or 110 using the mapping object based on “at least one database connection definition.” Rather, authentication in Lewis is used to grant access to the database (e.g., 108 or 110) to which the user of the computer access device 106 requested access. See Lewis, col. 3., ll. 27-34. Hence, the *directory information system 104* is not using the mapping object to map a user of the computer access device 106 to either database 108 or 110 based on at least one database connection definition. Hence, Lewis discloses that the user of the computer access device 106, not the directory information system 104, selects which database (e.g., database 108 or 110) the user seeks to access. See Lewis, col. 3, ll. 2-34. Thus, Lewis does not disclose that the directory information system 104 using a mapping object to map a user to either database 108 or 110 based on “at least one database connection definition.” Therefore, Lewis does not disclose “wherein the *centralized server* maps the user to at least one appropriate database based on the user request and *at least one database*

connection definition” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Lewis does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Therefore, claim 1 is in condition for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 2-5, 7-11, and 13-17 also are in condition for allowance for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 1.

B. Response to the Rejection of Claim 2

The Action rejects claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lewis. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 2 is allowable over Lewis for the reasons set forth above due to its dependency on claim 1. Claim 2 is also allowable for at least the two reasons set forth below.

First, Lewis does not disclose “wherein the database connection definition comprises a data source name and a set of properties for *establishing a database connection* to at least one database” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 2. Claim 1 recites that “the centralized server maps the user to at least one appropriate database based on the user request and *at least one database connection definition*” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1. Thus, the claimed centralized server maps a user to at least one appropriate database based on a user request and at least one database connection definition, which comprises a data source name and a set of properties for establishing a database connection to at least one database.

Lewis clearly fails to anticipate claim 2 because Lewis fails to disclose any such database connection definition for establishing a database connection to at least one database. To reject these claim features, the Action cites column 10, lines 37-52 of Lewis. These cited lines disclose

“named links,” which contain both a “connect string and the appropriate user credentials . . . for the relevant account on the remote server” and “allow a user on a first database to execute a procedure at a second database using the security context of another user.” See Lewis, col. 10, ll. 38-44. Lewis also discloses that “the user at the first database may create a procedure or function with an *embedded linking operation* that performs one or more operations at the second database.” See Lewis, col. 9, ll. 58-60. Thus, the links disclosed in Lewis are between databases 108 and 110, not between the directory information system 104 and the databases 108 or 110. Hence, the *directory information system 104* is not mapping a user of the computer access device 106 to either database 108 or 110 based on the named links. Therefore, Lewis does not disclose that the *directory information system 104* maps a user of the computer access device 106 to either database 108 or 110 based on at least one named link, which comprises a data source name and a set of properties for establishing a database connection to database 108 or 110.

Second, Lewis does not disclose that the directory information system 104 maps a user to database 108 or 110 based on named links that include a set of properties for establishing a database connection to at least one database. Instead, Lewis discloses that the user of the computer access device 106 communicates authentication information to “the respective database for which access is sought.” See Lewis, col. 3, ll. 6-10. Then, the “centralized directory information system 104 communicates with each database 108 and 110 to authenticate users that seek to access any of the databases serviced by the centralized directory information system 104.” See Lewis, col. 3, ll. 20-24.

In other words, the computer access device 106 of Lewis has already identified the database (e.g., database 108 or 110) to which access is sought and has established a connection with this database before the directory information system 104 communicates with either the

database 108 or 110 to authenticate the user. See Lewis, col. 3, ll. 6-26. Hence, Lewis does not disclose that the directory information system 104 maps the user to a database based on named links that include a set of properties *for establishing a database connection* to database 108 or 110. Thus, Lewis does not disclose a centralized server that maps a user “to at least one appropriate database based on the user request **and** *at least one database connection definition*” (emphasis added) (see claim 1), “wherein the database connection definition comprises a data source name and a set of properties for *establishing a database connection* to at least one database” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 2. Therefore, claim 2 is also allowable over Lewis and is in condition for allowance for reasons independent of the allowability of claim 1.

Claims 8 and 14 also are independently in condition for allowance for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 2.

III. RESPONSE TO THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 4, the Action rejects claims 6, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lewis in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2001/0049717 to Freeman et al. (“Freeman”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 respectively depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, which are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 6, 12, and 18 also are in condition for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Therefore, claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

It is believed that no additional fees are due for filing this Response. However, the Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicants also authorize the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP



By: _____
Brian Buroker
Registration No. 39,125

Dated: November 29, 2006

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)